

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-24 were originally pending. Claims 1, 4, 10, 16, and 22 were amended. No claims are added, canceled, or withdrawn. Thus claims 1-24 remain pending. Withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and/or objections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification has been amended to include a brief description of figure 5.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 was amended to correct a grammatical error. Claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 were amended to more particularly point out and claim the subject matter of the invention.

35 USC §112, Second Paragraph Rejections

Claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, the Office Action ("Action") indicates that the use of the phrase "and/or" does not properly refer to options in the alternative. Claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 have been amended to remove the phrase "and/or", and more particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter of the invention.

Withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections is respectfully requested.

35 USC §102(b) Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-16, and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) has been anticipated by U.S. patent application 5,845,0812 Rangarajan et al. ("Rangarajan"). This rejection is traversed.

A fundamental aspect of 35 USC §102(b) is that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is described in a single prior art reference (MPEP §2131.01). Rangarajan does not describe each and every feature of claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-16, and 19-22 for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "sending a remote application discovery request to a Web service, the Web service being deployed on a remote applications publication (RAP) Web server in the Intranet, the remote application discovery request being sent to the Web service by the remote client computer via a public network coupling the remote client computer to the Web server", and "responsive to the sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service, the discovery response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet for terminal server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer." Rangarajan does not describe these recited features.

In addressing claim 1, the Action asserts that Rangarajan's element 139 of figure 1 describes "the Web service being deployed on a remote applications publication (RAP) Web server on the Intranet". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Let's take a look at what Rangarajan describes regarding element 139 of figure 1. Rangarajan at col. 8, lines 22 through 39 explicitly describes:

"The NetWare Management System export import service 139, referred to as an NXIS, is an example of a network management

1 *information service for IPX networks that can provide available*
2 *network information upon request. [...] The network information can*
3 *include the identification of nodes which are part of the network, the*
4 *topology of the network, the services provided by the network or by*
5 *the nodes on the network, status information as the network changes*
6 *including information about events or alarms, etc."*

7 The immediately preceding cited portion of Rangarajan describes a
8 NetWare management system that provides network information upon request.
9 The network information may identify network nodes, network topology, and
10 network services status information regarding events or alarms. Rangarajan at
11 col. 7, lines 9 and 10, explicitly describes that "[e]ach network node is shown as a
12 general-purpose computer." Thus, Rangarajan explicitly describes that the
13 NetWare management system, responsive to a request, may provide the requester
14 with information regarding network computers, topology, services, and status
15 information. Clearly, this description of Rangarajan does not teach or suggest "the
16 discovery response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet for
17 terminal server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer", as
18 claim 1 recites. Applicant respectfully submits that this lack of explicit
19 description is probably because Rangarajan does not expressly or inherently
20 describe terminal services or terminal servers in any manner. Therefore,
21 Rangarajan does not describe each and every feature of claim 1.

22 Accordingly, the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by
23 Rangarajan is improper and should be withdrawn.

24 **Claims 2-4** depend from claim 1 and are allowable over Rangarajan solely
25 by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of
claims 2-4 should be withdrawn.

1 Additionally, claims 2-4 include further features that are not explicitly or
2 inherently described by Rangarajan.

3 For example, claim 3 recites "wherein the at least one application is
4 multiple applications, respective ones of the multiple applications having been
5 published by multiple information sources on the Intranet." In addressing claim 3,
6 the Action at section 8, asserts that Rangarajan at col. 10, lines 1-7, and figure 1,
7 network service A and B, describes "multiple applications having been published
8 by multiple information sources on the Intranet", as claim 3 recites. Applicant
9 disagrees.

10 The section cited by the Action, Rangarajan at col. 10, lines 1-7, which
11 describes Fig. 1, explicitly describes:

12 *"FIG. 2, NXIS 139 may have access to NXIS data which includes*
13 *IPX network information for network 160. This network information*
14 *may include the following: node identification information for node*
15 *140 and node 224; network topology for network 160; network*
services offered for network 160, including NetWare service B 182;
network 160 status information such as events or alarms, etc."

16 Clearly, this description of Rangarajan merely indicates that network information
17 may identify nodes (i.e., computers), network topology (device connections),
18 network services, and status (events or alarms) information. Nowhere does this
19 description described anything such as a published application. Additionally,
20 Rangarajan at col. 8, lines 9-17 explicitly describes that network services A and B
21 respectively provide a service A to nodes using the IP protocol and a service B to
22 nodes using the IPX protocol. Nowhere does Rangarajan explicitly or inherently
23 describe "multiple applications having been published by multiple information
24 sources on the Intranet", as claim 3 recites.
25

1 Accordingly, and for this additional reason the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of
2 claim 3 is improper and should be withdrawn.

3 In another example, claim 4 recites "wherein the at least one application is
4 multiple applications, respective ones of the multiple applications having been
5 published by multiple information sources on the Intranet, the multiple
6 information sources comprising one or more of a directory service, a Systems
7 Management Server (SMS), and an office computer associated with the user." At
8 least for the reasons described above with respect to claim 3, Rangarajan does not
9 describe "multiple applications having been published by multiple information
10 sources on the Intranet", as claim 4 recites.

11 For this additional reason, Rangarajan does not anticipate claim 4.

12 Additionally, Rangarajan does not explicitly or inherently describe "a
13 directory service", as claim 4 recites. Rangarajan's description of network
14 services (e.g., network services A and B) is completely silent with respect to any
15 "directory service". Moreover, nowhere does Rangarajan indicate that a person of
16 ordinary skill in the art at time of invention would have considered such a
17 "directory service" to be necessarily present in the system of Rangarajan. As such,
18 the claimed "directory service" is not expressly or inherently described by
19 Rangarajan.

20 For this additional reason, Rangarajan does not anticipate claim 4.

21 Moreover, section 9 of the Action asserts that Rangarajan's network
22 management system export import system, element 139 describes the claimed
23 "Systems Management Server (SMS)". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Let's
24 take a look at what Rangarajan describes regarding the network management
25

1 system export import system, element 139, of figure 1. Rangarajan at col. 8, lines
2 22 through 39 explicitly describes:

3 *“The NetWare Management System export import service 139,*
4 *referred to as an NXIS, is an example of a network management*
5 *information service for IPX networks that can provide available*
6 *network information upon request. [...] The network information can*
7 *include the identification of nodes which are part of the network, the*
8 *topology of the network, the services provided by the network or by*
9 *the nodes on the network, status information as the network changes*
10 *including information about events or alarms, etc.”*

11 Nowhere does this cited portion of Rangarajan explicitly or inherently describe
12 that Rangarajan's element 139 is a "Systems Management Server". Systems
13 Management servers implement remote computing device configuration
14 management. Thus, Rangarajan's network management system export import
15 system, element 139 does not teach or suggest the claimed "Systems Management
16 Server (SMS)" representing one of "multiple information sources on the Intranet"
17 for publishing "respective ones of the multiple applications", as Applicant claims.

18 Accordingly, and for this additional reason, Rangarajan does not anticipate
19 claim 4.

20 **Claim 7** recites "sending a remote application discovery request to a Web
21 service, the Web service being deployed on a remote applications publication
22 (RAP) Web server in the Intranet, the remote application discovery request being
23 sent to the Web service by the remote client computer via a public network
24 coupling the remote client computer to the Web server", and "responsive to the
25 sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service, the discovery
response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet for terminal
server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer." For the reasons

1 already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Rangarajan does not anticipate
2 these recited features.

3 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by
4 Rangarajan is improper and should be withdrawn.

5 **Claims 8-10** depend from claim 7 and are allowable over Rangarajan solely
6 by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, and at least for these reasons, the 35
7 USC §102(b) rejection of claims 2-4 should be withdrawn.

8 Additionally, for the reasons described above with respect to claims 3 and
9 4, the additional features of claims 9 and 10 are not anticipated by Rangarajan.
10 For these additional reasons the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 9 and 10
11 should be withdrawn.

12 **Claims 13** recites "sending a remote application discovery request to a Web
13 service, the Web service being deployed on a remote applications publication
14 (RAP) Web server in the Intranet, the remote application discovery request being
15 sent to the Web service by the remote client computer via a public network
16 coupling the remote client computer to the Web server", and "responsive to the
17 sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service, the discovery
18 response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet for terminal
19 server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer." For the reasons
20 already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Rangarajan does not anticipate
21 these recited features.

22 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claim 13 as anticipated by
23 Rangarajan is improper and should be withdrawn.
24
25

1 **Claims 14-16** depend from claim 13 and are allowable over Rangarajan
2 solely by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, and at least for these reasons,
3 the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claims 14-16 should be withdrawn.

4 Additionally, for the reasons described above with respect to claims 3 and
5 4, the additional features of claims 15 and 16 are not anticipated by Rangarajan.
6 For these additional reasons the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 15 and 16
7 should be withdrawn.

8 **Claim 19** recites “means for sending a remote application discovery request
9 to a Web service, the Web service being deployed on a remote applications
10 publication (RAP) Web server in the Intranet, the remote application discovery
11 request being sent to the Web service by the remote client computer via a public
12 network coupling the remote client computer to the Web server”, and “means for
13 responsive to the sending, receiving a discovery response from the Web service,
14 the discovery response identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet
15 for terminal server (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer.”
16 For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Rangarajan does
17 not anticipate these recited features.

18 Accordingly, the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claim 19 as anticipated by
19 Rangarajan is improper and should be withdrawn.

20 **Claims 20-22** depend from claim 19 and are allowable over Rangarajan
21 solely by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, and at least for these reasons,
22 the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claims 20-22 should be withdrawn.

23 Additionally, for the reasons described above with respect to claims 3 and
24 4, the additional features of claims 21 and 22 are not anticipated by Rangarajan.
25

1 For these additional reasons the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 21 and 22
2 should be withdrawn.

3
4 **35 USC §103(a) Rejections**

5 Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a)
6 as being unpatentable over Rangarajan in view of U.S. patent No. 6,247,052 to
7 Huang. This rejection is traversed.

8 **Claim 5** recites “[a] method as recited in claim 1, wherein responsive
9 receiving the discovery response from the Web service, the remote client computer
10 presents respective shortcuts to the user, each shortcut corresponding to an
11 individual one of remote applications identified in the discovery response, each
12 shortcut being selectable by the user to invoke a terminal service, the terminal
13 service executing a corresponding remote application on an associated installation
14 point on the Intranet.” In addressing claim 5, the Action, in section 12, admits that
15 Rangarajan fails to teach or suggest these recited features. To try to overcome this
16 conceded deficiency of Rangarajan, the Action modifies Rangarajan in view of
17 Huang. Specifically, the Action at p. 5 asserts that these claimed features are
18 taught by the abstract, figure 7, and col. 7, lines 49-53 of Huang. Applicant
19 respectfully disagrees.

20 For the reasons already described above with respect to claim 1, Rangarajan
21 does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1, upon which claim 5 depends.
22 More particularly, as already discussed, Rangarajan teaches a NetWare
23 management system that provides network information upon request. The
24 network information may identify network nodes, network topology, and network
25 services status information regarding events or alarms. Rangarajan at col. 7, lines

1 9 and 10, explicitly teaches that "[e]ach network node is shown as a general-
2 purpose computer." Thus, Rangarajan teaches that the NetWare management
3 system, responsive to a request, may provide the requester with information
4 regarding network computers, topology, services, and status information. Clearly,
5 this description of Rangarajan does not teach or suggest "the discovery response
6 identifying at least one application installed on the Intranet for terminal server
7 (TS) based access by a user of the remote client computer", as claim 1 recites.
8 Applicant respectfully submits that this lack of teaching or suggestion is probably
9 because Rangarajan does not teach or suggest terminal services or use of terminal
10 servers in any manner.

11 Now, let's look at those portions of Huang that the Action asserts describe
12 the claimed features that are conceded as missing from Rangarajan. The abstract
13 of Huang explicitly describes:

14 *"A graphic user interface launcher for providing graphic displays*
15 *for enabling one or more users to access a telecommunications*
16 *switching system for any desired purpose, such as to monitor,*
17 *control or reconfigure the telecommunications switching system.*
18 *Users may access the telecommunications switching system from any*
19 *remote location using a standard remote computer having a*
20 *browser. The remote computer uses the browser and a*
21 *communications link to access a remote server which contains the*
22 *application program necessary for a user of the remote computer to*
23 *remotely access the telecommunications switching system. The*
24 *remote server then provides a copy of the application program to the*
25 *remote computer, typically in the form of a Java Applet. The remote*
computer runs the application program, typically in a stand-alone
capacity, and accesses a system manager building block via a
second communications link. The system manager building block is
part of an overall telecommunications switch management system, of
which the GUI launcher is also a part. The system manager building
block is also in communication with another portion of the
telecommunications switch management system, namely a system
management interface software building block, which implements

1 *communication between the remote computer and the*
2 *telecommunications switching system."*

3 The above-cited portion of Huang explicitly teaches a graphic user interface
4 launcher to provide graphic displays, which in turn provides access to a
5 telecommunications switching system. A user, with a remote browser, interfaces
6 with a remote server to obtain a copy of an application program for execution on
7 the remote computer. The remote computer executes the application program
8 "typically in a stand-alone capacity" to then interface with a system manager
9 component which in turn facilitates communications between the remote computer
10 and a telecommunications switching system.

11 Clearly, this explicit description of Huang's abstract is completely silent
12 with respect to any teaching of "the remote client computer presents respective
13 shortcuts to the user, each shortcut corresponding to an individual one of remote
14 applications identified in the discovery response, each shortcut being selectable by
15 the user to invoke a terminal service, the terminal service executing a
16 corresponding remote application on an associated installation point on the
17 Intranet", as claim 5 recites.

18 Additionally, and referring to figure 7 of Huang, Huang explicitly describes
19 within respective ones of the operations of figure 7, that:

- 20 • a graphical display is depicted,
- 21 • a shelf of application cards is selected,
- 22 • a desired function is selected,
- 23 • another graphical display such as shown in figure 5 is presented,
- 24 • a specific application card is selected, specific function is selected,
- 25 • the display is changed to that shown in figure 6,

- 1 • parameters are configured, and then
- 2 • an apply command is invoked.

3
4 As Huang describes at col. 3, lines 4-10, figures 5 and 6 merely present
5 "exemplary next display[s] in the series of displays provided by the Graphical
6 Shelf Navigator". Nowhere do these displays for the operations of figure 7
7 described above teach or suggest using a shortcut to access a terminal service.
8 Thus figure 7 of Huang does not teach or suggest "the remote client computer
9 presents respective shortcuts to the user, each shortcut corresponding to an
10 individual one of remote applications identified in the discovery response, each
11 shortcut being selectable by the user to invoke a terminal service, the terminal
12 service executing a corresponding remote application on an associated installation
13 point on the Intranet", as claim 5 recites.

14 Moreover, the other section of Huang cited by the Action (col. 7, lines 49-
15 53) merely describes: "[i]n the example depicted in FIG. 12 , the user can select
16 from the GUI Launcher 8 options designated as "Monitor", "Configuration",
17 "Applications", "Performance", and "Security". Other selections may also be
18 provided instead of, or in addition to, the exemplary selections depicted in FIG.
19 12." Clearly, this additional description of Huang is completely silent with respect
20 to using shortcuts to access anything, let alone a terminal service.

21 In view of the above, Rangarajan and/or Huang does not teach or suggest
22 "[a] method as recited in claim 1, wherein responsive receiving the discovery
23 response from the Web service, the remote client computer presents respective
24 shortcuts to the user, each shortcut corresponding to an individual one of remote
25 applications identified in the discovery response, each shortcut being selectable by

1 the user to invoke a terminal service, the terminal service executing a
2 corresponding remote application on an associated installation point on the
3 Intranet", as claim 5 recites.

4 Accordingly, the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 5 over Rangarajan in
5 view of Huang is improper and should be withdrawn.

6 **Claim 6** depends from claim 5 and is allowable over the cited combination
7 solely by virtue of this dependency.

8 Accordingly, the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 6 over Rangarajan in
9 view of Huang should be withdrawn.

10 Additionally, claim 6 includes further features that are not taught or
11 suggested by Rangarajan in view of Huang. For example, claim 6 recites
12 "wherein the shortcuts represent a merged view of the remote applications, the
13 merged view being independent of respective ones of one or more installations
14 points on the Intranet." In addressing this feature, the Action admits that
15 Rangarajan fails to teach or suggest shortcuts represent a merged view of remote
16 applications, wherein the merged view is independent of respective ones of one or
17 more installations points on the Intranet. However, the Action concludes that
18 these claim features would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the
19 art at the time of invention over Rangarajan in view of Huang's Fig. 12. This
20 conclusion is unsupportable at least for the following reasons.

21 Huang at col. 3, lines 24 and 25, explicitly describes that Fig. 12 is an
22 exemplary top-level display screen provided by a GUI launcher. Huang at col. 7,
23 lines 42-54, explicitly describes:

24 *"FIG. 12 depicts an exemplary top-level display provided by GUI*
25 *Launcher 8, which would be generated if the user enters a valid*

1 *User ID and password in the Login Screen depicted in FIG. 11. This*
2 *top-level display provides the user with the first layer of selections*
3 *regarding the type of access the user is seeking into the*
4 *Telecommunications Switch Management System and the*
5 *accompanying Telecommunications Switching System 230. In the*
6 *example depicted in FIG. 12, the user can select from the GUI*
7 *Launcher 8 options designated as "Monitor", "Configuration",*
8 *"Applications", "Performance", and "Security". Other selections*
9 *may also be provided instead of, or in addition to, the exemplary*
10 *selections depicted in FIG. 12."*

11 This teaching of a top-level display providing selections to user to indicate the
12 type of telecommunications switch management system access that is being sought
13 is completely silent with respect to any teaching or suggestion of "a merged view
14 of the remote applications, the merged view being independent of respective ones
15 of one or more installations points on the Intranet", as claim 6 recites. Nowhere
16 do these cited portions, or Huang as a whole, teach or suggest any such "merged
17 view" or "installations points".

18 Accordingly, and for these additional reasons, the 35 USC 103(a) rejection
19 of claim 6 over Rangarajan in view of Huang should be withdrawn.

20 **Claim 11** recites "responsive to receiving the discovery response from the
21 Web service, instructions for presenting respective shortcuts to the user, each
22 shortcut corresponding to an individual one of remote applications identified in the
23 discovery response, each shortcut being selectable by the user to invoke a terminal
24 service, the terminal service executing a corresponding remote application on an
25 associated installation point on the Intranet." For the reasons already described
above with respect to claim 7, upon which claim 11 depends, Rangarajan does not
teach or suggest the features of claim 7. Additionally, for the reasons already

1 described above with respect to claim 5, the combination of Rangarajan in view of
2 Huang does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 11.

3 Accordingly, the 25 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 11 over Rangarajan in
4 view of Huang is improper and should be withdrawn.

5 **Claim 12** recites “wherein the shortcuts represent a merged view of the
6 remote applications, the merged view being independent of respective ones of one
7 or more installations points on the Intranet.” For the reasons already described
8 above with respect to claim 6, the combination of Rangarajan in view of Huang
9 does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 12.

10 Accordingly, the 25 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 12 over Rangarajan in
11 view of Huang is improper and should be withdrawn.

12 **Claim 17** recites “responsive to receiving the discovery response from the
13 Web service, instructions for presenting respective shortcuts to the user, each
14 shortcut corresponding to an individual one of remote applications identified in the
15 discovery response, each shortcut being selectable by the user to invoke a terminal
16 service, the terminal service executing a corresponding remote application on an
17 associated installation point on the Intranet.” For the reasons already described
18 above with respect to claim 13, upon which claim 11 depends, Rangarajan does
19 not teach or suggest the features of claim 17. Additionally, for the reasons already
20 described above with respect to claim 5, the combination of Rangarajan in view of
21 Huang does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 17.

22 Accordingly, the 25 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 17 over Rangarajan in
23 view of Huang is improper and should be withdrawn.

24 **Claim 18** recites “wherein the shortcuts represent a merged view of the
25 remote applications, the merged view being independent of respective ones of one

1 or more installations points on the Intranet.” For the reasons already described
2 above with respect to claim 6, the combination of Rangarajan in view of Huang
3 does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 18.

4 Accordingly, the 25 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 18 over Rangarajan in
5 view of Huang is improper and should be withdrawn.

6 **Claim 23** recites “wherein the remote client computer further comprises,
7 responsive to receiving the discovery response from the Web service, means for
8 presenting respective shortcuts to the user, each shortcut corresponding to an
9 individual one of remote applications identified in the discovery response, each
10 shortcut being selectable by the user to invoke a terminal service, the terminal
11 service executing a corresponding remote application on an associated installation
12 point on the Intranet.” For the reasons already described above with respect to
13 claim 19, upon which claim 23 depends, Rangarajan does not teach or suggest the
14 features of claim 19. Additionally, for the reasons already described above with
15 respect to claim 5, the combination of Rangarajan in view of Huang does not teach
16 or suggest these recited features of claim 23.

17 Accordingly, the 25 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 23 over Rangarajan in
18 view of Huang is improper and should be withdrawn.

19 **Claim 24** recites “wherein the shortcuts represent a merged view of the
20 remote applications, the merged view being independent of respective ones of one
21 or more installations points on the Intranet.” For the reasons already described
22 above with respect to claim 6, the combination of Rangarajan in view of Huang
23 does not teach or suggest these recited features of claim 24.

24 Accordingly, the 25 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 24 over Rangarajan in
25 view of Huang is improper and should be withdrawn.

1
2 **Conclusion**

3 Pending claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully
4 requests action to this end. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the
5 application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance
6 of a subsequent Office action.

7
8 Respectfully Submitted,

9
10 Dated: 5/13/05

By: Brian G. Hart
Brian G. Hart
Reg. No. 44, 421
(509) 324-9256